

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
FOR THE  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**June 19, 2003  
MINUTES**

The one hundred and fortieth meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-Chair Neil Cullen called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

Members attending the meeting were: George Bagdon, Merrill Buck, Neil Cullen, Craig Ewing, Howard Goode, Geoff Kline, John Lisenko, Jon Lynch, Rick Mao, Parviz Mokhtari, Meg Monroe, Ruben Niño, Van Ocampo, Larry Patterson, and Mo Sharma.

Others attending the meeting were: Joe Hurley (Transportation Authority), Onnolee Trapp (CMAQ), Kenneth Folan (MTC), Jim Bigelow (CMAQ), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Richard Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), Joseph Glowitz (Iteris), David Nelson (Alliance), Zachary Chop (Caltrans), Duncan Jones (Atherton), Diana Lee (SamTrans), and Walter Martone (C/CAG).

Absent from the meeting were: April Chan, Dennis Chuck, Ray Davis, Kent Dewell, Mark Duino, Gene Gonzolo, Corinne Goodrich, and Marc Roddin.

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

None.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.**

- Review and approval of Resolution 03-06 adopting the C/CAG 2003-04 Program Budget and Fees.
- Response to the Grand Jury report on Bicycle Safety in San Mateo County.
- Review and approval of the reallocation of Transportation Enhancements Activities (TEA) funding in the amount of \$300,000 from the City of Belmont – U.S. 101 Bike Over crossing Project to on-going TEA projects sponsored by San Carlos, San Mateo, and San Mateo County.
  - It was noted that the Belmont funds are actually going to the Ralston Interchange project and not to the three cities noted on the agenda.
- Review of the City of Half Moon Bay's request for an extension of time for the Route 92 Widening Project in the amount of \$485,146 under the Transportation Development Act, Article 3.
- Review of potential policy, criteria, and processes to encourage "Use it or Lose it" of funding for projects.
  - It was noted that the C/CAG Board wants more accountability from project sponsors to ensure that projects are delivered on schedule.
- The May 19th CMAQ meeting was canceled.

**3. Minutes from April 17, 2002 meeting.**

It was noted that Mo Sharma was present at the meeting.

*Motion: To approve the minutes as corrected. Unanimous.*

#### **4. Process for developing projects to include in the reauthorization of Measure A.**

At the City/County Engineers' Association meeting that immediately preceded the TAC meeting, the following was discussed.

- June 30<sup>th</sup> was established as the date that applications for candidate projects would be due. Changes to the applications resulting from City Council and Board actions would be accepted until September 1<sup>st</sup>.
- The percentage share of the reauthorized Measure A funding that would go to local jurisdictions for local streets and roads was discussed at great length.

Discussion by the TAC members included:

- In order to show value for the voters, the Measure should specify the types of projects that the local share will be used for.
- Currently most cities do not have sufficient funding for their local street and road maintenance. They rely on the Measure A funds for this purpose. The 20% currently allocated in the Measure for this purpose is not sufficient.
- The City/County Engineers have suggested that there be some flexibility in the definition of the uses of the local share of the Measure A funds; however the ambiguity should be minimized.
- The City/County Engineers will be sending a letter that will recommend that the TAC define categories of allowable uses for the local share of Measure A. A TAC subcommittee composed of Larry Patterson, John Lisenko, Parviz Mokhtari, Rick Mao, Van Ocampo, Neil Cullen, Joe Hurley, Geoff Kline, and Sandy Wong will meet on Monday, July 7<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. at San Mateo County Public Works to develop the recommended categories.
- Howard Goode raised concerns over a recent newspaper op ed article written by John Lisenko.
  - Transit providers felt that they were under attack in the article.
  - It will be very difficult to get the two-thirds majority vote needed to pass the reauthorization of Measure A. Attacks on the current program will hurt the effort to pass the reauthorization.
  - The Countywide Transportation Plan presents a balanced program and was adopted by C/CAG and the other transportation agency boards after significant debate and discussion. We shouldn't attempt to undermine it because there is some disagreement.
  - We need to present a united front to enhance the chances of passage of the reauthorization. It is important to respect the process and to ultimately joint together to support the decisions that were adopted.
- John Lisenko noted that the intent of the newspaper piece was to raise sensitivity to certain issues and to ensure that they get included in future discussions. The article was targeted at the reauthorization and was not intended as an attack on the current Measure A program.
- There is not a clear understanding of how the criteria for new projects was developed and agreed to. It does not appear that it was presented to the TAC.
  - The ½ mile criteria was developed by staff and reported to the TAC.

- The data from the focus groups was used to establish corridors as the priority for projects instead of specific State Highways.
- The list of projects for the reauthorization needs to be balanced between items that will clearly help transportation and also those that specifically respond to the desires of the voters.
- There needs to be a parallel process that makes the identified needs fit into predetermined categories and also uses identified needs to define the categories of funding.
- It was suggested that the criteria be made more flexible – that the ½ mile limit not be a strict limit.
- More non-highway projects should be allowed to be submitted.
- TAC members were advised that if there is any doubt as to whether a project qualifies or that it might be submitted by another agency, that member should go ahead and submit the project.
- It was suggested that a regional approach be used for selecting projects.
- It was suggested that the process be iterative – the 1<sup>st</sup> step will be to identify the universe of projects, and then this information can be used to develop a plan.
- It was suggested that the MTC survey of local maintenance needs be used as a basis for documenting the need for funding local streets and roads projects.

## **5. Project Study Reports (PSRs).**

Sandy Wong reported:

- Any time a project is using State money, it must have a PSR done prior to programming in the STIP. This also applies if it is a complex project, a project that requires cooperative agreements, or a locally funded project over \$750,000.
- Jurisdictions are being requested to identify projects that meet these qualifications and report them to Caltrans so that they can be scheduled. To date there have been little response.
- Caltrans assistance on PSRs is free to all local jurisdictions.
- All or most of the Measure A projects are already in the pipeline with Caltrans.

## **6. Congestion Management Program (CMP) schedule for 2003 and status of Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs).**

Sandy Wong reported:

- The CMP is a legally enforceable document.
- Projects must be listed in the CMP in order to be included in other programming documents such as the STIP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan, and Federal Transportation Plan.

## **7. Schedule for the 2004 STIP.**

Geoff Kline reported:

- There is no or very little money available for the next STIP cycle. Therefore there may not be a call for projects.
- In the end of October 2003 the California Transportation Commission will prepare an estimate of the funds available.

## **8. Scoring process for Federal and State funding.**

Geoff Kline reported:

- In the future there will be more poor air quality areas, therefore there will be less funding for each individual area.
- If a new or extended Federal program is approved in the fall, applications for projects will likely be due in September/October 2004.
- The first year of the new Federal program has already been programmed.
- In future applications for funding, the projected change in Level of Service will have to be certified by a traffic professional or engineer.
- Readiness will be an important factor in the selection of projects.
- Local match will be an important factor in the selection of projects. The greater the local funding the higher the score for the project.
- Further information on the Federal application process will be brought to the TAC when it becomes available.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the definition of eligible projects include any road served by a fixed transit route in addition to roads on the Metropolitan Transportation System.

#### **9. Response to Grand Jury Report on Bicycle Safety Issues.**

It was suggested that there be further discussion on the recommendation that each jurisdiction must establish a bicycle advisory committee. This item will be taken up by the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

#### **10. Peninsula Corridor 2020 Study.**

Walter Martone reported that C/CAG is working together with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and the Silicon Valley Transportation Authority to sponsor a study of transportation improvements to address congestion going to and from the Dumbarton Bridge.

#### **11. Items of interest/new business.**

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

NOTE: COPIES OF HANDOUTS FROM MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST BY CONTACTING WALTER MARTONE AT 599-1465.